

## **Exhibit D**



## DETAILED INFORMATION ON THE USAID'S DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE FOR SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA ASSESSMENT

- [View this program's assessment summary.](#)
- [Visit ExpectMore.gov to learn more about how Federal Government programs are assessed and their plans for improvement.](#)
- [Learn more about detailed assessments.](#)

**Program Code** 10004603

**Program Title** USAID's Development Assistance for Sub-Saharan Africa

**Department Name** Int'l Assistance Programs

**Agency/Bureau Name** Agency for International Development

**Program Type(s)** Competitive Grant Program

**Assessment Year** 2005

**Assessment Rating** Adequate

Assessment Section Scores	Section	Score
	Program Purpose & Design	80%
	Strategic Planning	88%
	Program Management	80%
	Program Results/Accountability	50%

**Program Funding Level** **FY2007 \$596**

(in millions) **FY2008 \$611**

**FY2009 \$490**

**Note:** Funding levels for 2006 and 2007 have not been finalized at the time of publication. Funding information will be updated on ExpectMore.gov as this information becomes available.

- [Ongoing Program Improvement Plans](#)
- [Completed Program Improvement Plans](#)
- [Program Performance Measures](#)
- [Questions/Answers \(Detailed Assessment\)](#)

### Ongoing Program Improvement Plans

Year Began	Improvement Plan	Status	Comments
2005	Implementing the new Strategic Framework for Foreign Assistance so that program resources are allocated to best advance U.S. foreign policy priorities and recipient country progress.	Action taken, but not completed	USAID has initiated reform of its budgeting process to better allocate program resources according to recipient country performance. This process reinforces the Strategic Framework for Foreign Assistance, which aligns aid resources with U.S. foreign policy priorities. Budgets are allocate to program areas that best advance each country's progress, and that in turn advance U.S. policy. The result is a budget focused on country progress continuously monitored for program effectiveness.
2005	Developing and applying common outcome goals to assure program advancement, especially of Presidential Initiatives.	Action taken, but not completed	Operating Units submitted Operational Plans conforming to the Strategic Framework for Foreign Assistance with standardized goals and performance measures aligned with the Standardized Program Structure and related standard Indicators. This ensures that similar activities such as those through a Presidential Initiative contribute to common outcomes. During FY07, ongoing programs and monitoring tools were cross-walked with the standardized structure to encourage contribution toward agreed goals.
2005	Align country mission staff levels and operating expense funds with International assistance levels to increase program efficiency.	Action taken, but not completed	The Africa Bureau is refining its Resource Harmonization Model to guide restructuring of our overseas presence. This model is a sophisticated tool for allocating staff to missions taking into consideration program size, economies of scale and difficulty of doing business. The use of this tool ensures that staffing size is appropriate for the management of our programs across various levels of funding and complexity.

### Completed Program Improvement Plans

**Year Began** **Improvement Plan** **Status** **Comments**

### Program Performance Measures

**Term** **Type**

**Long-term Outcome** **Measure:** Value of exports to US from AGOA countries where USAID is active (excluding fuel products, in billions \$)

**Explanation:** Calculated using total imports minus energy, minerals, and metals

**Year** **Target** **Actual**

2004 Baseline 3450

2005 3450 2900

2006 3500 3200

2007	3500	3587
2008	3590	
2009	3600	
2010	3600	
2011	3610	
2012	3610	

Annual Efficiency Measure: Program dollars expended by rural households benefiting directly from the program.

*Explanation:* The proportion of DA account that supports agricultural programs is high and as such, this indicator is representative of the account.

Year	Target	Actual
2004	\$150	\$134.33
2005	\$125	\$35.98
2006	\$100	\$25.82
2007	\$30	\$26.48
2008	\$30	
2009	\$30	

Annual Output Measure: Number of individuals benefiting directly from USAID agriculture interventions

*Explanation:*

Year	Target	Actual
2008	17,665,567	
2009	18,548,845	
2004	Baseline	19,759,500 (All)
2005	5,429,460 (IEHA)	6,922,817 (IEHA)
2006	8,500,000 (IEHA)	9,679,750
2007	10,500,000 (IEHA)	16,824,350

Long-term Outcome Measure: Hectares under improved management for biodiversity conservation

*Explanation:*

Year	Target	Actual
2012	90,000,000	
2011	85,000,000	
2010	80,000,000	
2009	75,000,000	
2008	71,728,610	
2004	Baseline	15,758,998
2005	17,547,212	19,000,000
2006	19,335,427	21,049,267
2007	21,800,000	63,980,019

Annual Outcome Measure: Percentage of fragile states, in which a peace process has been successfully concluded, where 25% or more of internally displaced persons return home or are voluntarily resettled

*Explanation:*

Year	Target	Actual
2008	60%	
2009	60%	
2004	Baseline	14%
2005	20%	42%
2006	25%	56%
2007	30%	58%

Long-term Outcome Measure: Median cost to register a business as a share of per capita gross national income

*Explanation:*

Year	Target	Actual
2012	94%	
2011	96%	
2010	98%	
2004	Baseline	124.5%
2005	121.4%	139.6%
2006	118.9%	120%

2007	115.9%	106%
2008	103%	
2009	100%	

Annual Outcome Measure: Average net enrollment in primary education

*Explanation:* pending data analysis

Year	Target	Actual
2001	Baseline	58.7%
2004	64%	64.2%
2005	64.5%	65%
2006	65%	67.6%
2007	68.0%	68.8%
2008	68.2%	
2009	68.4%	

Long-term Outcome Measure: Percentage of targeted local government areas that are more responsive to citizens interests

*Explanation:*

Year	Target	Actual
2012	65	
2011	65	
2010	64	
2009	63	
2008	62	
2004	Baseline	37
2005	39	40
2006	50	60
2007	61	61

Long-term Outcome Measure: Percent of fragile states where USAID is working that show a biennial improvement in political stability thereby moving closer to TD targets

*Explanation:* Kauffman-Kraay Index

Year	Target	Actual
2012	60%	
2011	55%	
2010	55%	
2009	50%	
2004	Baseline	35%
2006	40%	46%
2008	50%	

Long-term Outcome Measure: Girls' primary education completion rate

*Explanation:* pending data analysis

Year	Target	Actual
2010	58%	
2011	58.3%	
2012	58.5%	
2001	Baseline	46%
2004	55%	55%
2005	56.2%	58%
2006	56%	56%
2007	57%	58.6%
2008	57%	
2009	57.5%	

Long-term Outcome Measure: Agricultural productivity in areas of USAID interventions

*Explanation:*

Year	Target	Actual
2012	6.0%	
2011	6.0%	
2010	6.0%	

2009	6.0%
2008	6.0%
2004 Baseline	0
2005	3.6% 22%
2006	3.6% 7.18%
2007	6.0% 6.0% est.

Annual      Output      **Measures:** Number of firms directly participating in USAID-sponsored activities to strengthen their competitiveness and productivity

**Explanation:**

Year	Target	Actual
2008	34,000	
2009	36,000	
2004 Baseline	22,477	
2005	27,605	21,782
2006	32,732	27,605
2007	32,732	33,000 est.

### Questions/Answers (Detailed Assessment)

#### Section 1 - Program Purpose & Design

Number	Question	Answer	Score
1.1	Is the program purpose clear?	YES	20%

**Explanation:** The program has a well-defined broad objective; however, the program's activities are spread across a broad spectrum of sector and country activities with insufficient financial resources to have a major impact in many of them. As directed by appropriations legislation, the Development Assistance (DA) account funds activities for free-market economic development, agriculture, rural development, literacy and basic education for children and adults, environment, energy, science and technology and other programs related to longer-term transformational development. Any earmarks or restrictions are reflected in the annual Foreign Operations Appropriations Act. Priorities for DA funding in the AFR region are agriculture and the environment, trade, education, democracy and governance, and conflict mitigation. DA program funds will be increasingly directed towards those countries that are performing well, demonstrate need, and exhibit commitment to the principles of sound governance, investing in their people and economic freedom. The use of DA will be further clarified through the creation USAID's new Strategic Framework for Africa. AFR's use of DA funds is aligned with US foreign policy priority to advance sustainable development and global concerns and contribute to all Agency-wide goals of economic growth and agricultural development, democracy and good governance, human capacity building, and environmental protection. Each AFR Operating Unit (OU) aligns with the Bureau's program purpose via a limited number of country-specific strategic objectives (SOs). OUs are USAID field Missions, regional entities, and USAID/Washington Offices that expend program funds to achieve approved Strategic Objectives. In FY 2004, the AFR Bureau provided \$462.2 million in DA funds for 100 SOs managed by 31 OUs overseas and in Washington.

**Evidence:** 1) Secretary of State Statement in Bureau Performance Plans (BPPs), p.5-8 2) U.S. Department of State and U.S. Agency for International Development Strategic Plan: Fiscal years 2004-2009, p.18-25 3) Assistant Administrator Pierson testimony to SFRC, March 2, 2005, p.3-5 4) FY 2006 Congressional Budget Justification (CBJ) Africa overview 5) H.R. 4818 Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005: Development Assistance (entire document) 6) Strategic Framework for Africa

1.2	Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest, or need?	YES	20%
-----	--	-----	-----

**Explanation:** The DA program addresses numerous specific needs and problems within the AFR region. The DA program in the AFR region supports U.S. foreign policy interests while addressing country level needs. U.S. foreign policy interests include promoting broad-based economic growth, strengthening democratic processes, reducing poverty, protecting and improving health and nutrition, and environmental protection. Africa is the world's poorest region and the development challenges are diverse. Half of Africa's 700 million people live on less than \$1 a day. By 2015, it is forecasted that two-thirds of the world's hungry will be in Africa. The majority of the world's HIV/AIDS pandemic is in sub-Saharan Africa. Sub-Saharan Africa contains 45 percent of global biodiversity, yet has the highest rate of deforestation in the world. These challenges are documented through AFR's strategic planning processes, in the Budget Justification to Congress (CBJ), in sector summaries of USAID Annual Reports, as well as in development statistics from other institutions such as the World Bank and the UN Economic Commission for Africa. Additionally, challenges faced by each country are reflected in each Mission Performance Plan (MPP), which encompasses all activities of United States Government (USG) agencies working in the country and in the region.

**Evidence:** 1) Secretary of State Statement in Bureau Performance Plans (BPPs), p.5-8 2) U.S. Department of State and U.S. Agency for International Development Strategic Plan: Fiscal years 2004-2009, p. 18-25 3) Assistant Administrator Pierson testimony to SFRC, March 2, 2005, p.3-5 Example of a Sector Summary: Health, Population, and Nutrition Results Reporting, May 2004, p.69-84 4) A sample of statistics on Africa from the World Bank 5) Congressional Budget Justification (CBJ) Africa overview, FY 2006 (entire overview) 6) Selected Mission Performance Plans: Kenya 2006, p.3-6 and DROC 2006, p.3-7 7) Strategic Framework for Africa 8) President Bush comments on importance of Africa, June 13, 2005: [www.state.gov/p/afr/rm/2005/47285.htm](http://www.state.gov/p/afr/rm/2005/47285.htm) 9) UN Human Development Report 2004 [hdr.undp.org/reports/global/2004/pdf/hdr04\\_complete.pdf](http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/2004/pdf/hdr04_complete.pdf)

1.3	Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?	YES	20%
-----	--	-----	-----

**Explanation:** The DA program is designed so that it is not redundant or unnecessarily duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts. As the lead United States Government (USG) foreign assistance entity in a developing host country, USAID coordinates with all other in-country USG entities under the aegis of the U.S. Ambassador, as well as with the host government

and other prominent donors. This coordination serves to eliminate program redundancies and to promote country program synergies. USAID regularly signs inter-Agency agreements to avoid duplication of efforts and to create program synergies among all actors. Preparation of the annual Mission Performance Plan (MPP) is coordinated by the U.S. Embassy and documents all activities of USG agencies that are carried out in that country (see MPPs for Kenya and the Democratic Republic of Congo). Coordination issues are also addressed through Country Team meetings, involving the principals of all USG entities and chaired by the Ambassador, and are held on a weekly basis. Additionally, the Africa Bureau has developed a close working relationship with colleagues at the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) as they begin to sign compacts in African nations (Madagascar being the first MCC compact ever) and in administration of the MCA Threshold Country program. Furthermore, USAID and other bilateral and multilateral donors, the relevant host Government Office, and implementing partners including the UN health agencies meet regularly to share development experiences, and maximize assistance outcomes. Finally, the AFR DA program is able to actively coordinate with the private sector through the Global Development Alliance (GDA) mechanism of public-private partnerships, leveraging private sector resources and eliminating duplication of efforts. Nonetheless, the large number of aid donors, both public/official and private/NGO, with different programming, monitoring and enforcement, and accounting modalities seriously tasks the limited implementation capabilities of African aid recipient governments. Along with other donors, USAID agreed in the Paris declaration to simplify reporting procedures for host countries, an effort which needs to be strongly pursued in order to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of aid in African countries.

**Evidence:** 1) Mission Performance Plan: Kenya 2006, p.7-38 and DROC 2006, p.8-26 2) Department of State/USAID Joint Management Council Charter 3) Congressional Budget Justification (CBJ) Africa overview, FY 2006 : Other Donor section, p. 5 5) Global Development Alliance Guidelines 6) The Automated Directives System (ADS) - Sections 201.3.6 and 201.3.7 (pg. 26-38) Preparation of Strategic Plans. Section 201.3.9.2 Donor coordination analysis in the strategic planning phase. 7) Example GDA Initiative in AFR: Royal Ahold's Fruit and Vegetable Alliance 8) Examples of inter-agency agreements with other USG entities: Department of Treasury, Financial Planning and management technical assistance to the Government of Guinea; Department of State, Civilian Police officers for United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone.

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? NO 0%

**Explanation:** The DA program's effectiveness is constrained by extensive legislative earmarking, rigidities in the ability to shift funding between countries because of perceived entitlements, and program authorization and obligation modalities. Within these constraints, AFR operating units (OUS) develop a Results Framework (RF) for each strategic objective (SO), linking the development challenge being addressed to program implementation activities and milestones to be achieved. The SO is the most ambitious result in a particular program area that an operating unit (with its partners) can materially affect and for which it is willing to be held accountable. The RF is informed by various technical and resource analyses including evaluations, sector assessments, lessons learned, and gender and country conflict vulnerability analyses. The AFR Bureau's design process is initiated at the Mission level to ensure that the AFR Missions have strategies that are relevant to the specific country needs and circumstances. USAID requires that Operating Units include Washington customers, USAID partners, host country governments, the donor community, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), the private sector, and host country beneficiaries and stakeholders in the development of Strategy Statements. Under the Africa Bureau Framework, each Mission will update their Strategy Statement each year. All OU strategies are subject to intensive agency-wide reviews. ADS 201 details the planning/design process. The AFR bureau also has the flexibility to leverage funding from other sources including the private sector, foundations, etc. to increase the efficiency of the funds it expends through the DA account. Global Development Alliances (public-private partnerships) and donor coordination allow for this flexibility.

**Evidence:** 1) ADS 201, pg. 29-32 Content of Strategic Plans; ADS 201 pg. 45-51 Mandatory and other analyses for developing Strategic Plans. (Note that the ADS 201 is currently under revision) 2) Example of AFR review of OU Strategic Plan: Eritrea Strategy Review Cable 3) Global Development Alliance Guidelines 4) Examples of inter-agency agreements with other USG entities: Department of Treasury, Financial Planning and management technical assistance to the Government of Guinea; Department of State, Civilian Police officers for United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone. 5) Example GDA Initiatives in AFR: Royal Ahold's Fruit and Vegetable Alliance

1.5 Is the program design effectively targeted so that resources will address the program's purpose directly and will reach intended beneficiaries? YES 20%

**Explanation:** The DA program is effectively targeted to reach intended beneficiaries. Management in the AFR Bureau is decentralized in that individual strategies are developed and implemented by OUs that have constant and direct contact with the program beneficiaries. Widespread consultation with prominent partners, customers (including beneficiaries), and stakeholders is critical to the development and implementation of all OUs strategic plans. This consultation is done through meetings, workshops, retreats, and surveys. The results of these consultations are integrated into Strategy Statements. In addition, Country and Assistance Checklists are completed and cleared by all relevant offices including the General Counsel, Procurement, and Financial Management to ensure that USAID assistance is targeted at eligible countries and cooperating organizations that are registered with USAID and certified as having adequate financial and administrative systems and controls for receiving USAID funding. USAID is legally restricted from providing assistance to various organizations such as military and police. To ensure that services reach the intended beneficiaries, USAID independent evaluations (see 2.6) are conducted to validate program approaches and direction and serve as the basis for any mid-course corrections. USAID monitors assistance received by beneficiaries through evaluating data collected in the performance monitoring plan (PMP) as well as grantee/contractor reports, general project monitoring and field visits.

**Evidence:** 1) Example of Participatory Planning: Operational Unit Strategy: Ghana 2004-2010, p.23, p.99-148 2) ADS 201.3.42 Roles of Partners, Customers, and Stakeholders 3) ADS 201.3.3.4 Country Prohibitions and Restrictions 4) Statutory Checklists, 2005 (entire document) 5) TIPS Number 7: Preparing a Performance Management Plan 6) Example of a Performance Management Plan (PMP): South Africa SO 5 (entire document) 7) Selected Mission Annual Report: Uganda FY 2004, p. 8-19

Section 1 - Program Purpose & Design Score 80%

Section 2 - Strategic Planning	Number	Question	Answer	Score

2.1	Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?	YES 12%
-----	---	---------

**Explanation:** The Africa DA program does have specific long-term performance measures which are detailed in the Measures Tab. The process by which these outcome-focused performance measures were vetted assures that they reflect the purpose of the program. Overarching agency-wide long-term strategic goals are articulated in the Department of State and USAID Strategic Plan for Fiscal Year 2004 to 2009. The Department of State-USAID Joint Performance Plan is the forward-looking document that further defines the agency-level goals and targets. The strategic goals, which can be categorized under Democracy and Human Rights, Economic Prosperity and Security, and Social and Environmental Issues, inform the framework within which the agency, and subsequently, each geographic bureau, conducts its performance planning. Outcome-based performance measures were developed to track the progress of Africa's DA program in achieving the strategic objectives listed in the State-USAID joint strategy. Additionally, the Africa bureau is currently developing a Bureau Strategic Framework to set regional priorities and to align and harmonize a set of contextual and regional performance indicators that would provide valuable performance information to managers both in the field and at Washington headquarters. At the Operating Unit (OU) level, the regional performance indicators and targets, as well as baseline data, are or will be contained in every OU's Performance Management Plan (PMP). At the OU-level, there are identifiable long-term indicators and targets that are linked to the Strategic Objectives related to DA. These indicators and targets, as well as baseline data are contained in every OU's Performance Management Plan.

**Evidence:** 1) U.S. Department of State and U.S. Agency for International Development Strategic Plan: Fiscal years 2004-2009, p.1-4, 18-25 2) Joint Performance Plan, p.2-11, 36-62, 158-267 3) ADS 203 Performance Management (emphasis on ADS 203.2 through 203.3.5) 4) Agency FY 2004 Performance and Accountability Report, p.10-12, 24-36, 98-107,122-174 5) USAID Primer: What we do and how we do it, p.2-5, 18-20 6) Strategic Management Interim Guidance (entire document) 7) US Foreign Aid: Meeting the Challenges of the 21st Century, p.1-9, 17-23 8) Example of a Performance Management Plan (PMP); South Africa SO 5 (entire document) 9) Example of an Operational Unit Strategy: Ghana 2004-2010, p.21, 29-93 10) Selected Mission Annual Report: Uganda FY 2004, p. 8-34 11) 2005 Annual Reporting Guidance, Section I, Sub-section A, Item 5 p.6, Guidance Annex VIII, page 29

2.2	Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?	YES 12%
-----	--	---------

**Explanation:** Given the extreme poverty in most African countries, the weak economic, social, and political institutions, the widespread problems of poor transparency on government programs, and the systemic threat to progress that endemic diseases such as HIV/AIDS and malaria present, levels of ambition for foreign assistance programs in African countries must be cautiously assessed. The Africa Bureau's DA program has appropriately ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures. Examples of these targets and timeframes can be found in the Measures tab. AFR is currently completing an intensive, bureau-wide effort to develop a Strategic Framework for Africa with regional performance indicators and baseline data. A number of the indicators within this framework specify how Africa DA activities impact the greater African social and economic trends. They will also be used to assess progress against annual targets set by the Washington Bureaus and Missions in the field. Targets are expressed as percentages where appropriate, or as actual figures in cases where an actual quantified number can be used. Operating Units (OUs) are delegated the authority to define quantitative and verifiable targets and timeframes for their respective Strategic Objectives (SOs, the Bureau's key, ambitious and challenging measures), however these targets are reviewed and vetted by the Africa Bureau and PPC, and are reported each year in the Annual Report (AR). The OU's Performance Management Plan details targets by SO over the life of the program. OUs are responsible for data quality assessments to determine the measures' validity, reliability, timeliness, precision, and accuracy. The Africa Bureau reviews targets at the SO level during the strategy approval process and also during the Operational Unit intensive review process (every 3 years).

**Evidence:** 1) U.S. Department of State and U.S. Agency for International Development Strategic Plan: Fiscal years 2004-2009, p.18-25 2) Joint Performance Plan p.40-62, 158-267 3) Selected Mission Annual Report: Uganda FY 2004, p.8-34 4) OU-level Indicators - South Africa SO 5 (entire document) 5) Draft USAID/Guinea Triennial Review Reporting Cable 6) ADS 203.3.5 Data Quality Assessments 7) ADS 203.3.3 Performance Management Plans

2.3	Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?	YES 12%
-----	--	---------

**Explanation:** USAID's performance management framework is structured around a limited number of ambitious but achievable strategic objectives and goals (developed jointly with the Department of State) as part of the Joint Performance Plan writing process. The AFR DA performance goals, targets, and indicators are logically linked to these long-term joint goals and objectives, enabling USAID to demonstrate progress towards achieving them. (For example, the annual performance measure of "average net enrolment in primary education" leads to the long-term outcome indicator (and goal of increased) "girls' primary education completion rate.") The AFR Bureau measures its performance against this structure through a set of discrete, quantifiable, and measurable annual targets and contextual and performance indicators, which are monitored by the AFR Bureau and are reported each year in the annual reporting process. At the OU level, the PMP includes annual performance measures which are used to assess progress towards the program's long-term goals and objectives. The PMP provides baseline data, annual targets, and other important information. Performance of SOs is assessed and documented annually. The PMPs are based on grantee and contractor information but developed, designed, and managed by USAID staff. All partners regularly report on their performance as required by contract and grant agreements signed with USAID. AFR OUs review these performance reports, monitor and verify information in the field and via other sources.

**Evidence:** 1) U.S. Department of State and U.S. Agency for International Development Strategic Plan: Fiscal years 2004-2009, p.18-25 2) Joint Performance Plan, p.7-11, p.40-62, p.158-267 3) OU-level Indicators - South Africa SO 5 (entire document) 4) 2005 Annual Reporting Guidance, Section I, Sub-section A, Item 5 (Page 6) and Guidance Annex VIII, page 29

2.4	Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?	YES 12%
-----	--	---------

**Explanation:** Building on a deep understanding of the challenges inherent in achieving meaningful progress in African Development, the DA program has taken great care in selecting a series of annual performance measures with ambitious, yet achievable targets. Annual performance measures exist at both the OU and the regional level. At the OU level, baselines and targets are documented in each OU's Performance Management Plans and Annual Reports. Baselines and targets are included for measures related to higher level Strategic Objectives (SOs) as well as the Incremental Intermediate Results (IRs) that represent milestones towards achieving each SO. Targets are reviewed carefully when new strategies are submitted to AFR/Washington for

approval to ensure they are sufficiently ambitious. Data are reported against those targets and used to inform management decisions. Similarly ambitious targets exist for annual performance measures at the regional level. Baselines and targets for regional annual performance measures are contained in the Measures tab of this PART submission.

**Evidence:** 1) Example of a Performance Management Plan (PMP): South Africa SO 5 (entire document) 2) ADS 203.3.2, 203.3.3, 203.3.4, 203.3.5, 203.3.10 Performance Management, performance management plans, selecting performance indicators, and data quality. 3) Selected Mission Annual Report: Uganda FY 2004 p.8-19

2.5	<b>Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?</b>	YES	12%
-----	--	-----	-----

**Explanation:** At the OU-level, Strategic Objective Agreements (SOAGs) with host Governments outline the terms of agreement, including commitment to shared goals of USAID/AFR OUs and host country counterparts. Solicitation documents for contractors and grantees such as Request for Proposals (RFP), Request for Applications (RFA), or Annual Program Statements (APS) incorporate SO and/or program objectives. Respondents to the RFP or RFA must articulate how they will contribute to the achievement of AFR Mission Strategic Objectives. The extent to which they are able to help achieve these shared objectives and goals is evaluated in the technical merit criterion of the selection criteria. Grants and Contract Agreements reflect these shared commitments to common goals in the scope of work section. These commitments are likewise reflected in Contractors and Grantees annual work plans. By the terms and conditions of their agreements, contractors and grantees provide quarterly progress reports to OUs that document their results to date. USAID managers verify information in these reports through monitoring, site visits, and meetings. The information in the OU's PMP includes results reported and verified from contractors and grantees. All of these activities are designed and carried out to ensure that USAID partners commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program.

**Evidence:** 1) ADS 350.3.1-350.3.2 SOAGs 2) ADS 303.5.5 b and c - Evaluation criteria for grants 3) Example of Work Plan: TBD 4) Example of a Performance Management Plan (PMP): South Africa SO 5 (entire document) 5) Request for Proposal Number 690-04-0027- Malawi (Section C4- Targeted Results, Pages C3, C5-C14)

2.6	<b>Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?</b>	YES	12%
-----	--	-----	-----

**Explanation:** Evaluations are intended to look at results achieved vs. targets/goals, program impact and effectiveness, and lessons learned. In the past five years approximately 154 evaluations have been conducted for the AFR Bureau's programs, including DA-funded activities. A break-out of evaluations of DA-only activities is not available because evaluations are often cross-sectoral and activities can involve multiple funding sources. Evaluations can be internal, external, collaborative or participatory, and are generally completed by entities outside of the AFR Bureau including independent private firms not directly associated with the activity or program, the Office of the Inspector General, or USAID's Center for Development Information and Evaluation (CDIE). The AFR bureau uses mid-term evaluation recommendations to introduce course corrections and final evaluations to determine whether further assistance should be directed to that technical sector. Evaluations are used to provide input to inform key management decisions, to evaluate performance data that indicates an unexpected result or finding which cannot be readily explained, to investigate customer or partner feedback that suggests there are implementation problems or unmet needs, to re-examine program sustainability, to assess cost-effectiveness or relevance, and to identify lessons learned.

**Evidence:** 1) AFR list of evaluations, as compiled by USAID's Center for Development Information and Evaluation 2) ADS 203.3.6 provides Agency guidance on evaluations

2.7	<b>Are budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?</b>	NO	0%
-----	--	----	----

**Explanation:** The Africa Bureau's model for preparing budget requests, when fully implemented, will explicitly tie significant portions of the budget requests to accomplishment of annual and long-term performance goals as specified in the Bureau Program Budget Submissions (BPBS) and the Congressional Budget Justifications (CBJ). When a majority of Operating Unit Strategic Objectives are performance scored and factored into budget allocations, this portion of the PART will warrant a yes response. The Africa Bureau budget model contained in the BPBS documents how funding is to be reallocated within and between OUs based on performance. For example, each OU reviews (typically on a semi-annual basis) its performance vis-??-vis approved strategies. OUs prepare an Annual Report (AR) that summarizes program progress by Strategic Objective (SO) including: whether targets were met, reviewing the financial status of the SO, and planned resource requirements for the SO. The AFR Bureau leads a comprehensive review of all OU ARs, which may include other relevant Washington Offices. Informed by the review findings and recommendations and taking other factors into consideration such as country need and commitment, foreign policy considerations and administration priorities, and DA sector focus, the AFR Bureau decides on resource levels for each OU and rolls up the information for determining the aggregate BPBS for the Bureau. In terms of transparency, the CBJ presents in a succinct and transparent manner all the SOs by country, their progress to date, and the OU's requested funding levels by SO.

**Evidence:** 1) Congressional Budget Justification 2006 (pending) 2) FY 2006 Annual Budget Submission, p.1-4,8-10 3) Selected Mission Annual Report: Uganda FY 2004 (entire document) 4) 2006 Bureau Program Budget Submission: Africa Bureau Model p. 3-5

2.8	<b>Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?</b>	YES	12%
-----	---	-----	-----

**Explanation:** In response to the need for more centralized planning of the United States' foreign policy and development assistance programs, the Department of State and USAID jointly developed the Strategic Plan for Fiscal Year 2004 to 2009. For the first time in the history of both entities, strategic planning was combined to form a more coherent foreign policy and development strategy. The strategic objectives and specific long-term performance goals contained in the Strategic Plan constitute the top-level strategic planning framework for both agencies. All plans, targets, and results are tied to the Joint Strategic Plan. To facilitate performance monitoring and reporting under the Joint State/USAID strategies, the AFR Bureau is completing an extensive effort to align and harmonize a set of contextual and regional performance indicators that would provide valuable performance information to managers both in the field and at Washington headquarters. The AFR Bureau Framework will provide the vital link among Joint State/USAID strategic objectives, strategic goals, performance goals, contextual and common performance indicators at the regional level, and annualized performance targets. USAID's long-term performance goals are

supported by outcome and/or output-related performance measures and regional indicators which are used to assess progress towards completion of the long-term goals, and allow Agency management to re-direct programs where necessary. At the OU-level, the regional performance indicators and targets, as well as baseline data, are or will be contained in every OU's Performance Management Plan (PMP). At the OU-level, there are identifiable long-term indicators and targets that are linked to the Strategic Objectives related to DA. These indicators and targets, as well as baseline data, are contained in every OU's Performance Management Plan (PMP). AFR conducts intensive reviews of OU strategies at least once every three years in accordance with USAID policy (ADS 203.3.10). This is a mechanism used by USAID to determine if the strategy is going as planned or whether the situation has evolved such that the strategy or implementation needs to be adjusted. (See answer to question 2.6.) This is a mechanism used by the AFR Bureau to redirect strategy when on-the-ground reality evolves in a different direction. After the review a management cable is sent to the OU outlining the results of the reviews. The annual report process serves to verify that corrective actions have been taken.

**Evidence:** 1) U.S. Department of State and U.S. Agency for International Development Strategic Plan: Fiscal years 2004-2009, p.18-25 2) Joint Performance Plan, p.2-11, 36-62, 158-267 3) AFR Bureau Approved Bureau Framework Regional Indicators (pending) 4) Agency FY 2004 Performance and Accountability Report, p.10-12, 24-36, 98-107,122-174 5) ADS 203 Performance Management (emphasis on ADS 203.2 through 203.5) 6) Example of AFR review of OU Strategic Plan: Eritrea Strategy Review Cable 7) ADS 203.3.10 Intensive Program Reviews 8) Draft USAID/Guinea Triennial Review Reporting Cable 9) Strategic Management Interim Guidance (entire document) 10) 2005 Annual Reporting Guidance, Section I, Sub-section A, Item 5 (Page 6) and Guidance Annex VIII, page 29

			Section 2 - Strategic Planning	Score	88%
Section 3 - Program Management	Number	Question		Answer	Score
3.1		<b>Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?</b>		YES	10%
		<i>Explanation:</i> USAID regularly collects timely and credible performance information from key program partners and from field missions. Funding recipients are required as part of their contractual or grant agreements to manage, monitor, and report performance information on a regular basis. This information is submitted to Operating Units (OUs) on a quarterly basis and aggregated into the Annual Report (AR) and Performance Management Plans for each activity annually. OUs indicate in the AR the status of targets for programs. The AFR Bureau, in turn, reviews OU performance via the AR review process. When targets are not met, various options may be considered depending on the specific circumstances and issues involved: the contract or grant agreement may be modified, additional funds may be delayed or not provided, management changes may be introduced, discussions may take place with other partners (other donors or host-country) regarding their commitment, etc. If goals are exceeded the OU will decide whether to set new targets or to focus on other interventions. The AR review process in turn feeds into Bureau decisions about programming, budgeting, and staffing during the Bureau Program Budget Submission (BPBS) process. Managing Agency funds in a timely way is also an important part of OU performance information. Based on Agency policy and AFR Bureau's analysis, an OU's program may not receive its full increment of funds in a subsequent year if it is determined that an unacceptable level of funds is still unspent (undisbursed). According to Agency policy, a program can only have unspent funds sufficient to cover expected disbursements for the next 12-18 months. This policy is strictly enforced by the AFR Bureau Development Planning Office.			
		<i>Evidence:</i> 1) Selected Mission Annual Report: Uganda FY 2004 (entire document) 2) AFR Bureau Annual Report Sector Summary: Health, Population, and Nutrition Results Reporting 3) Operating Unit Performance Management Plan (PMP), with South Africa as a sample (see sections on data analysis, data utilization, and dissemination for each indicator.) 4) USAID's ADS 202.3.6- Monitoring timeliness of key outputs 5) USAID adherence to 22 CFR 226, "Administration of Assistance Awards to US Non-governmental Organizations," Section 226.51, "Monitoring and Reporting Program Performance"; (from ADS 303.7 Mandatory Reference for Grants.) 6) 2005 Annual Reporting Guidance, Cover Memo and Section I, Sub-section A, Item 5 (Page 6) and Guidance Annex VII, (Pages 34-36) - completing performance measures table, including setting targets 7) DRAFT PPC Guidance on FY 2007 BPBS submissions, (Executive Summary and Overview, Page 3; Part 2- Budget and Performance Integration, Pages 7-8)			
3.2		<b>Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?</b>		YES	10%
		<i>Explanation:</i> Federal Managers at both the senior and programmatic level are held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results. Senior managers are responsible for broad program categories and are reviewed based on the performance of the entire portfolio under their purview. Annual portfolio reviews are used to assess progress in meeting goals, and each manager is assessed against their statement of duties on a semi-annual basis, which includes duties related to effectively managing their portfolio of projects. AFR-Washington Geographic Directors also exercise rigorous oversight of Senior Managers' performance in the field regarding cost, schedule and performance results on an even more frequent basis. At the contract management level, USAID cognizant technical officers (CTO) and program partners are held accountable for cost, schedule, and performance results. A cognizant technical officer (CTO) is designated for each AFR activity to manage contractors and grantees. CTO responsibilities include, among others, the technical review and approval of vouchers, monitoring contractor/grantee performance and financial status, and overseeing sub-agreements. The Agency recently re-established a training program to certify CTOs responsible for managing contracts and grants. The courses are designed to provide CTOs with the basic skills and knowledge to effectively carry out the role of a CTO. The Agency will soon require all current and potential CTOs to take this training program to assure consistent oversight of all Agency partners. Under USAID's personnel evaluation process, CTOs are evaluated for effective management of agreements, including the quality of technical guidance provided to contractors and grantees. The Agency also offers a course for CTO supervisors to enable them to more effectively provide on-the-job training and to better monitor and evaluate the performance of a CTO. Past performance of contractors and grantees is a criterion for all awards. Institutional capability and past performance are a large part of the selection criteria. Performance-based type of contracts and agreements are used to focus contractors on achievement of program results. Mid-term evaluations are also used to review performance to date and identify issues.			
		<i>Evidence:</i> 1) CTO responsibilities as defined in ADS 303.3 (Page 8) 2) DRAFT CTO Certification requirement agency notice (entire document) 3) Request for Proposal Number 690-04-0027- Malawi (Section C4- Targeted Results, Pages C6-C14; Section E3- Monitoring and Evaluation, Page E1; Section F- Deliveries or Performance, Pages F1-F5) 4) Mid-term evaluation of Zambia NRM program (Lessons Learnt and Conclusion and Recommendations Sections, Pages 29-34) 5) Course description of CTO Certification Programs (entire document)			

3.3	<b>Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?</b>	YES 10%
<i>Explanation:</i> USAID DA funds are obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose. Obligations, among other financial data, are tracked via Phoenix, the Washington-based accounting system that is being rolled out worldwide over the next 14 months, and the Mission Accounting and Control (MACS) field-based legacy accounting system. AFR/DA funds are provided on an incremental, as-needed basis, with specific amounts determined by the budget and final Operating Year Budget setting processes. Once funds are obligated, OUs and the AFR Bureau monitor disbursements over the life of the program. Based on Agency policy and AFR Bureau's analysis, an OU's program may not receive its full increment of funds in a subsequent year if it is determined that an unacceptable level of funds is still unspent (undisbursed). According to Agency policy, a program can only have unspent funds sufficient to cover expected disbursements for the next 12-18 months. This policy is strictly enforced by the AFR Bureau Development Planning Office. Additionally, the Cognizant Technical Officer (CTO) of each grant, contract, or cooperating mechanism is responsible for monitoring this process. Finally, all OUs are required to prepare procurement plans that outline planned procurements and obligations and help ensure that funds are spent in a timely manner and for the intended purpose.		
<i>Evidence:</i> 1) ADS 602 - Agency guidance regarding forward funding of programs. 2) ADS 202.3.8.3- Obligations Management 3) FY 2006 Annual Budget Submission (Page 6)		
3.4	<b>Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?</b>	YES 10%
<i>Explanation:</i> Missions undertake periodic portfolio reviews which provide a systematic and comprehensive view of the each activity at the Mission level. Through the strategic planning reform process, AFR is defining ways to improve operations and to help rationalize the allocation of scarce staff and operating expense (OE) resources. Specifically, the Africa Bureau is undertaking a Resource Harmonization exercise that will significantly reallocate staff and operating expenses across Missions in Africa. The results of this exercise are being taken into account during the development of the Agency Strategic Framework for Africa. Individual missions also have additional items flagged for improvement. Finally, AFR Bureau adheres to all Federal regulations on competition.		
<i>Evidence:</i> 1) ADS 300 provides the overall guidance on procurement including competitive procurements (ADS 302.5.8 for Contracts and 303.5 for Grants). 2) AIDAR 706.501- Mandatory Reference for Competition 3) FY 2006 Annual Budget Submission (Pages 3-6)		
3.5	<b>Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?</b>	YES 10%
<i>Explanation:</i> The program collaborates and coordinates effectively with related programs across the United States Government (USG) and with other international donors. Most notably, the Department of State and USAID have recently developed joint goals at the Department/Agency level via the Joint State-USAID FY 2004-2009 Strategic Plan which formalizes the relationship highlighted in the answer to 1.3. Historically, State and USAID have planned and implemented programs collaboratively at the country level via the MPP process, which will now influence the joint State/USAID Strategic Plan. Weekly country team meetings are held among USG agencies and regular coordination meetings with other donors in AFR countries with USAID missions. The Annual Budget Submission (ABS) process is a joint effort between State and USAID and is reflected in the FY 2006 ABS. Many USAID staff are "seconded" to other USG agencies and institutions and this helps with coordination. In addition, the AFR Bureau and its OUs collaborate and coordinate with related programs: participation in the Joint Management Council and Joint Policy Council; close working collaboration with State counterparts at the Bureau and country levels- especially through the MPP review process; memos of understanding with other Federal Agencies; staffing arrangements with other USG agencies; Inter-agency working groups such as with the State Counter-Terrorism task force; Consultative Groups with other donor agencies. Notably, AFRICA has developed a close working relationship with colleagues at the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) as they begin to sign compacts in African nations (Madagascar being the first MCC compact ever) and in administration of the MCA Threshold Country program. Finally, the Bureau actively seeks public-private partner alliances in common development areas. Once these relationships are established they are evaluated and monitored through the annual program review process.		
<i>Evidence:</i> 1) U.S. Department of State and U.S. Agency for International Development Strategic Plan: Fiscal years 2004-2009, (Messages from Secretary of State and USAID Administrator, Preface; Mission, Pages 1-4; Achieving Peace and Security, Pages 5-8; Advance Sustainable Development and Global Interests, Pages 18-29; Organizational Impacts, Pages 39-40) 2) Example of State Department Mission Performance Plan (MPP) - Kenya, FY 2006 (Chief of Mission Statement, references to USAID program partnerships throughout the text.) 3) Example of State Department Mission Performance Plan (MPP) - Democratic Republic of Congo, FY 2006 (Chief of Mission Statement, references to USAID program partnerships throughout the text.) 4) Examples of USAID Global Partnerships 5) Global Development Alliance (GDA) Brochure (entire document) 6) Example of public-private partner alliance: GDA alliance with the Chevron Texaco in Angola. 7) FY 2006 Annual Budget Submission. (Page 2) 8) State/USAID announcement of Joint Policy and Joint management Councils for cooperation and coordination between the agencies 9) MCA CEO Paul Applegarth testimony before HIRC on joint USAID-MCC planning, May 19 2004 10) Assistant Administrator (AA) Pierson testimony to SFRC, March 2, 2005 (p. 11)		
3.6	<b>Does the program use strong financial management practices?</b>	NO 0%
<i>Explanation:</i> Through the Federal Managers Financial Integrity Act (FMFIA)/Management Control Review Committee process, USAID ensures that resources are protected against fraud, waste and abuse and that they achieve the results for which funds were appropriated. The process requires each OU in the AFRICA Bureau to do a self-assessment of the adequacy of management controls in all areas of agency operations including program, administrative, and financial management. Each OU submits an FMFIA memo to the AFRICA Bureau, which in turn submits a Bureau memo to the USAID Administrator. AFRICA grants and contractors are also subject to audits. Currently, the Phoenix system is used for Washington accounting and the MACS system for field accounting. Using two separate systems has created a disconnect between the two. However, USAID is rolling out the Phoenix system to the field, which should ensure streamlined accounting operations when the roll-out is complete. During FY 2005, USAID Ghana became the first Phoenix pilot mission in Africa, servicing accounting operations for USAID Ghana, the West Africa Regional Program, Liberia and Nigeria. When the rollout is completed, it is anticipated that the answer to this PART section will become yes/		
<i>Evidence:</i> 1) Federal Manager's Financial Integrity Act (FMFIA) checklist 2) Africa Bureau FMFIA memo to USAID Administrator dated September 3, 2004 3) FMFIA Material Weaknesses reported by USAID AFRICA Missions for FY 2004 4) ADS 620 chapter - Financial management principles and standards (entire chapter) 5) Agency FY 2004 Performance and Accountability Report (Administrator's Letter, Pages 5-7; Chief Financial Officer's Letter, Pages 8-9; Management's Discussion and Analysis, Pages 72-89) 6) ADS 596 - Management Accountability and Control		

3.7	<b>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?</b>	YES	10%
-----	---	-----	-----

**Explanation:** The program has taken meaningful steps to address management deficiencies. For example, the FMFIA process requires each OU in the AFRICA Bureau to do a self-assessment of the adequacy of financial management controls in all areas of agency operations, including management of program assistance. Each OU submits an FMFIA memo to the Africa Bureau, which in turn submits a Bureau memo to the USAID Administrator. At the OU level, Africa Bureau missions address deficiencies or weaknesses that could appropriately be resolved at that level. Any significant deficiency or material weakness (whether new or unresolved from previous FMFIA reviews) is reported to the AFR Bureau and included in the Bureau FMFIA memo to the Administrator. Steps for resolving the weakness are identified and a date proposed by which the weakness or deficiency will be corrected. Any deficiencies are also noted publicly in the Agency Performance and Accountability Report each year.

**Evidence:** 1) ADS 620, FMFIA checklist. 2) AFR Bureau FMFIA memo to USAID Administrator dated September 3, 2004 3) FMFIA Material Weaknesses reported by USAID AFR Missions for FY 2004 4) FY 2006 Annual Budget Submission (Pages 3, 5-6, 10, 12, 16, 21-23)

3.C01	<b>Are grants awarded based on a clear competitive process that includes a qualified assessment of merit?</b>	NO	0%
-------	---	----	----

**Explanation:** To the maximum extent permitted by legislation and statute, AFR Bureau contracts and grants are awarded competitively, except where supported by documentation approved by officials with authority to approve non-competitive awards. However, because of the above exceptions the percentage criteria for a yes response cannot be met. Where competitively awarded, Requests for Proposals (RFPs), Requests for Assistance (RFAs) and Annual Program Statements (APSs) are all posted publicly at [www.fedgrants.gov](http://www.fedgrants.gov). All decisions on grant and contract awards are properly documented (via selection memos, memos of negotiation, etc.). USAID Washington (via the Office of Acquisition and Assistance) reviews and provides oversight to ensure AFR adherence to Federal regulations and Agency guidance on competition. Procurement integrity is taken very seriously and all CTOs are trained in the specific regulations USAID employees are required to follow during the procurement process. Additionally, all USAID staff are required to take ethics training on a regular basis. This training includes instruction on procurement integrity.

**Evidence:** 1) ADS 300 provides the overall guidance on procurement including competitive procurements (ADS 302.5.8 for Contracts and 303.5 for Grants). 2) AIDAR 706.501- Mandatory Reference for Competition 3) FY 2006 Annual Budget Submission (Pages 3-6) 4) ADS 202.3.9 - Avoiding conflicts of interest, ensuring procurement integrity, complying with ethics rules, and meeting audit responsibilities (entire section) 5) Sample Annual Program Statement: Public-Private Alliances, [www.fedgrants.gov/Applicants/AID/OP/WAS/GDA-05-001/listing.html](http://www.fedgrants.gov/Applicants/AID/OP/WAS/GDA-05-001/listing.html)

3.C02	<b>Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?</b>	YES	10%
-------	---	-----	-----

**Explanation:** The AFR program has significant oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities. For example, a Cognizant Technical Officer (CTO) is designated for each program to manage contractors and grantees. CTO responsibilities include, among others, technical review and approval of vouchers, monitoring contractor/grantee performance and financial pipelines, and sub-awards. The Activity Manager and the SO Team Leader, who may or may not be the CTOs, also provide oversight. In addition, mission management is kept informed of program performance, progress, and issues via periodic portfolio reviews, staff meetings, etc. The AFR Bureau, in turn, is informed via the Annual Review process. The OU Agreement Officer is the mandatory control point of record for all official communications and contacts with the recipient that may affect the award budget, the program description or any terms and conditions of the award. Audits per OMB Circular A-133 or recipient-contracted audits are also conducted as required by policy or regulation.

**Evidence:** 1) CTO responsibilities as defined in ADS 303.3 (Page 8) 2 ADS 202.3.9.4- Conducting Audits 3) USAID FY 2004 Performance and Accountability Report (entire report)

3.C03	<b>Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?</b>	YES	10%
-------	---	-----	-----

**Explanation:** [OMB NOTE DELETED] The AFR Bureau collects grantee performance data and makes it available to the public in print and via the Internet. In preparing USAID's reporting documents, the data supplied by the various grantees and contractors are utilized to support AFR Bureau's analysis and program descriptions. Disclosure to the public is done in a number of different ways. For example, the USAID FY 2004 Performance and Accountability Report (PAR) publicly discloses program performance and financial information at the Agency level. The PAR is distributed in hard copy annually to Congress, OMB, USAID Missions, and partner organizations. It is also available to the general public via the Internet and by request on the USAID website. The Congressional Budget Justification (CBJ, available on the USAID web site) provides specific information to the public on AFR programs including information on SO performance and results, and by country (OU). The CBJ also indicates the various grantees and contractors working in the different SOs. USAID's Center for Development Information and Evaluation (CDIE), via the Development Experience Clearinghouse (DEC), makes evaluations of specific programs available to the public. Additionally, the Bureau of Policy and Program Coordination (PPC) is starting a new program to conduct and collect additional evaluations and train a new cadre of evaluation specialists in the Agency. Finally, the Africa Bureau Information Center (ABIC) maintains the USAID Africa Bureau public website. Many different publications and resources are available to the public on the site.

**Evidence:** [NEW EVIDENCE PROVIDED AS #7 BELOW] 1) USAID FY 2004 Performance and Accountability Report (entire report) 2) Congressional Budget Justification (CBJ) Africa overview, FY 2006 3) List of currently available Africa Bureau Program/Activity evaluations available to public through the Development Experience Clearinghouse ([www.dec.org/partners/evalweb/](http://www.dec.org/partners/evalweb/)) 4) Evaluation of Recent USAID Evaluation Experience (Pages III-IV, entire document) 5) Course descriptions for Evaluation course. 6) USAID Africa Bureau website: [www.usaid.gov/locations/sub-saharan-africa/](http://www.usaid.gov/locations/sub-saharan-africa/) 7) Example link to CBJ information on performance at [www.usaid.gov/policy/budget/cbj2006/afr/ao.html](http://www.usaid.gov/policy/budget/cbj2006/afr/ao.html) 8) Example link to Annual Report Information on performance at [www.dec.org/partners/ar05/index.cfm?fuseaction=ucar2005.showNar&field=piped\\_summary&countrycd=654&historyIndex=1&keyword=](http://www.dec.org/partners/ar05/index.cfm?fuseaction=ucar2005.showNar&field=piped_summary&countrycd=654&historyIndex=1&keyword=)

Section 3 - Program Management Score 80%

Section 4 - Program Results/Accountability		Answer	Score
Number	Question		

4.1	<p><b>Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?</b></p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> The DA program in Africa has received a great deal of high-level attention in recent years, with new initiatives annually being rolled out prior to and in G-8 Summits. The Africa Bureau has needed to respond to these, as well as congressional initiatives, with new strategic frameworks, objectives, and long-term performance measures. The DA program is on-track to meet long-term performance goals, including the regional goals and the country-level OU indicators previously developed. Data demonstrating that DA is on track to meet the regional goals is listed in the Measures tab. OUs use PMPs to define how data will be collected to measure program progress which is reported in the Individual Mission's Annual Report (AR). OUs report in the AR whether targets are met or exceeded, in accordance with a scoring system maintained within the AR database to provide more informative performance information to management. Indeed in FY 2004 across USAID as a whole less than 10% of performance indicators were below targets.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> 1) U.S. Department of State and U.S. Agency for International Development Strategic Plan: Fiscal years 2004-2009 (entire document) 2) USAID FY 2006 Joint Performance Plan (entire document) 3) USAID FY 2004 Performance and Accountability Report (entire report) 4) Example of a Performance Management Plan (PMP): South Africa SO 5 (see specific updates throughout PMP) 5) Selected Mission Annual Report: Uganda FY 2004 (entire document) 6) Draft USAID/Guinea Triennial Review Reporting Cable</p>	<small>SMALL EXTENT</small> 8%
4.2	<p><b>Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?</b></p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> The AFR Bureau and its program partners generally achieve their annual performance goals. At the regional level, the AFR Bureau has specific, quantifiable annual targets and common regional indicators (contextual and performance as part of the Bureau Framework) for DA programs; these are shown in the Measures Tab of this PART submission. These measures are supplemented by country-level indicators which are contained in OU Performance Monitoring Plans (PMPs). The program is on-track to meet all of the annualized targets, including those which are joint targets with the Department of State and other program partners. At the country level, these measures are contained in OU PMPs. OUs report in their Annual Report whether targets are met, exceeded or not met. The PHP and Annual Report are the primary documents that show whether program performance is on track. These documents are, in large part, based on grantee and contractor (partner) information. In the case of DA, with very few exceptions, OUs at the country level report verified data that targets are met or exceeded. In FY 2004 across USAID as a whole less than 10% of performance indicators were below targets.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> 1) U.S. Department of State and U.S. Agency for International Development Strategic Plan: Fiscal years 2004-2009 2) USAID FY 2006 Joint Performance Plan (entire document) 3) AFR Bureau Approved Bureau Framework Regional Indicators 4) Example of a Performance Management Plan (PMP): South Africa SO 5 (see specific updates throughout PMP) 5) Selected Mission Annual Report: Uganda FY 2004 (entire document) 6) USAID FY 2004 Performance and Accountability Report (entire report)</p>	<small>SMALL EXTENT</small> 8%
4.3	<p><b>Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?</b></p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> The AFR program has demonstrated improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year. As part of the Strategic Framework process, AFR is developing a model to rationalize the allocation of scarce staff and operating expense resources. The results of this exercise and other management improvements are being factored into the development of the Framework. Additionally, AFR has significantly reduced the levels of obligated but undisbursed funds for individual OUs over the past several fiscal years.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> 1) FY 2006 Annual Budget Submission (entire submission) 2) CTO responsibilities as defined in ADS 303.3 (Page 8) 3) AFR Bureau FMFIA memo to USAID Administrator dated September 3, 2004 4) Resource Harmonization Overview 5) FY 2006 BPBS</p>	<small>LARGE EXTENT</small> 17%
4.4	<p><b>Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?</b></p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> The performance of the AFR/DA program compares favorably to other programs with similar purposes and goals. Because of its field presence and flexible programming, USAID is often cited by other donors and host governments for its ability to respond quickly, for both disaster assistance and standard international assistance, and for its leadership of country program coordination with other donors. The Development Assistance Committee (DAC) Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) conducts periodic reviews to improve the individual and collective development co-operation efforts of DAC members. The policies and efforts of individual members are critically examined approximately once every four years. The DAC found that The United States has a substantial impact on promoting economic growth and reducing poverty in developing countries due to the large size of its economy, its ability to influence world opinion and action and its weight within the international donor community. Nonetheless, the DAC also found that improvements could be suggested given the inefficiencies of congressional earmarks and a highly dispersed set of implementing agencies. In 2001 the United States was the largest donor in the OECD's Development Assistance Committee (DAC) in volume terms, reporting net official development assistance (ODA) of USD 10.9 billion, more than one-fifth of the DAC total. USAID, while getting some criticism in the report, also received praise from the DAC for new ideas for partnerships like the Global Development Alliance and for USAID strategic planning processes. Congress also recognizes the performance of USAID. On April 5, 2005 the House passed by a vote of 401-0, a resolution commending the efforts by the armed forces and civilian employees of the State Department and the U.S. Agency for International Development in response to the earthquake and tsunami of December 26, 2004. Some AFR staff were released from their regular duties to help in the tsunami recovery efforts.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> 1) 2002 US Peer Review of Assistance by OECD-DAC, 2) House of Representatives Resolution 120 commanding USAID staff on Asian Tsunami Response</p>	<small>NA</small> 0%
4.5	<p><b>Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?</b></p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> Independent evaluations have shown that DA programs are effective and achieving results. Independent evaluations are conducted at the OU/Mission level for sector specific or strategic objectives. These evaluations are done by independent consultants, IG or GAO and are of sufficient scope and quality to determine that AFR Mission programs are accomplishing or have achieved their goals. Furthermore, the Agency is reinvigorating the evaluation process at USAID through a new evaluations</p>	<small>LARGE EXTENT</small> 17%

training course and an increased prominence on conducting evaluations. Evaluations accessible to the public are on the USAID website at: [www.dec.org/partners/eval.cfm](http://www.dec.org/partners/eval.cfm). One example of how USAID uses evaluations is through the Presidential Initiative to End Hunger in Africa. Strategic analysis is being done for each participating USAID Missions agricultural portfolio to examine ex post and ex ante impacts of all of the interventions in the portfolio. This allows the various interventions and investments to be compared for their prospective impacts on the objectives of raising incomes, increasing agricultural productivity, increasing trade, and reducing poverty. Further, we support and participate in multi-donor programs to examine the impact from alternative investment and development strategies for achieving MDG and specifically assessing the economic impacts of agricultural development efforts on the MDGs. For example, in Ethiopia various sectors (livestock, cereals, roots and tubers, coffee, etc??) as well as alternative approaches, e.g., market development, productivity development, etc.. were examined to determine which offered the greatest chance of stimulating rural growth, reducing poverty, and addressing nutritional needs.

**Evidence:** 1) AFR list of evaluations, as compiled by CDIE 2) Evaluation of Recent USAID Evaluation Experience (Pages iii-iv, entire document) 3) ADS 202.3.9.4- Conducting Audits 4) evaluations accessible to the public are on the USAID website at: [www.dec.org/partners/eval.cfm](http://www.dec.org/partners/eval.cfm) 5) Example evaluation for Agriculture project in Zambia: [www.dec.org/pdf\\_docs/PDABX940.pdf](http://www.dec.org/pdf_docs/PDABX940.pdf)

Section 4 - Program Results/Accountability Score 50%

- 
- View this program's assessment summary.
  - Visit [ExpectMore.gov](http://ExpectMore.gov) to learn more about program assessment and improvement by the Federal Government.
  - Learn more about detailed assessments.

Last updated: 01292008.2005FALL